

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 98-2535

HENRY T. SANDERS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

THE STATE OF MARYLAND; CIRCUIT COURT OF MARY-
LAND FOR PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 99-1071

HENRY T. SANDERS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

THE STATE OF MARYLAND; CIRCUIT COURT OF MARY-
LAND FOR PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 99-1345

HENRY T. SANDERS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

THE STATE OF MARYLAND; CIRCUIT COURT OF MARY-
LAND FOR PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of
Maryland, at Greenbelt. J. Frederick Motz, Chief District Judge;
Peter J. Messitte, District Judge. (CA-98-2387-PJM)

Submitted: May 13, 1999

Decided: May 18, 1999

Before WIDENER and MOTZ,* Circuit Judges, and BUTZNER, Senior
Circuit Judge.

Nos. 98-2535 and 99-1345 affirmed and No. 99-1071 dismissed by
unpublished per curiam opinion.

Henry T. Sanders, Landover, Maryland, Appellant Pro Se. Maureen
Mullen Dove, Assistant Attorney General, Baltimore, Maryland, for
Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.
See Local Rule 36(c).

* Judge Motz did not participate in consideration of this
case. The opinion is filed by a quorum of the panel pursuant to 28
U.S.C. § 46(d) (1994).

PER CURIAM:

Henry T. Sanders appeals three district orders: (1) the denial of relief on his 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983 (West Supp. 1998) complaint under 28 U.S.C.A. § 1915(e)(2) (West Supp. 1998) (No. 98-2535), (2) the issuance of an order to show cause why Sanders should not be sanctioned (No. 99-1071), and (3) the denial of Defendants' motion for sanctions (No. 99-1345). We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinions and find no reversible error. Accordingly, in No. 98-2535, we grant leave to proceed in forma pauperis and affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Sanders v. Maryland, No. CA-98-2387-PJM (D. Md. Aug. 24, 1998). We grant leave to proceed in forma pauperis in No. 99-1071 but dismiss the appeal as interlocutory. Finally, we affirm the denial of Defendants' motion for sanctions in No. 99-1345 on the reasoning of the district court. See Sanders v. Maryland, No. CA-98-2387-PJM (D. Md. Feb. 25, 1999). We also deny all of Sanders' outstanding motions, including his motions for a stay, general relief, an injunction, sanctions, settlement alternatives, restoration to the argument calendar, alternatives, an interim stay, ex parte interlocutory relief, affirmative relief, mandate, expedition of appeal, writ of habeas corpus, transfer, judgment on counter and cross-claims, dismissal, evidentiary hearing, a show cause order, leave to file a memorandum, and default. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in

the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

Nos. 98-2535, 99-1345 - AFFIRMED

No. 99-1071 - DISMISSED